

**Unofficial
As of 04/11/07**

**HOOKSETT
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes**

April 10, 2007

Tracy Murphy Roche called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Attendance: Tracy Murphy Roche, Ron Savoie, Richard Bairam, James Levesque, Dick Johnson, Roger Duhaime, and James Gorton (non-voting Council Rep.)

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

RAVINIA COLD STORAGE

East Point Drive Map 49 Lot 4

Special Exception from Article 18 Section E to build a 340,000 sq ft building and access way that impact approximately 1.8 acres of wetlands. Variance from Article 18 Section G.2 a&b to grant a variance for a 340,000 sq ft building that will impact the wetland and wetland setback and buffer.

Tony Marcott: We were here last month for a preliminary discussion regarding Ravinia Cold Storage. It is a proposed two phase project. Phase one is 202,000 sq ft and phase two is just over 140,000 sq ft. It is a proposed freezer warehouse facility. Currently they have two facilities in Londonderry that total about 220,000 sq ft. This is located in a appropriate industrial district. We looked at several sites through out the state and this one seemed t make the most sense. We had site walk on March 31, 2007. We walked pretty much the entire area where the proposed wetland dredge and fill area. In the handout I handed out to you I included some bio-retention areas.

The only reason I mention that is because it is one of the measures that we are going above and beyond the NH DES regulations as well as the town regulations.

What we are proposing is all of the storm water that will come off the pavement in the loading dock area will go through bio-retention areas. Essentially the first one is the rainwater. It will be stored in these areas and will be treated in these areas through the plants that are selected for those areas. It is a mixture of plants that are made to survive inundation and there is a maintenance program that if these plants don't survive over time they are replaced. The only reason I mention that is it is just one of the measures that we are taking in mitigation for the proposed wetland dredge and fill. We are also working with the Conservation Commission and they are in the process of purchasing an area near Clay Pond. I understand that they recently got the Council's permission to go ahead and work on purchasing that. As part of the mitigation on this site we are looking to purchase at least 20 acres of one of those parcels that would be around 200,000 dollars towards that program. We are looking into doing onsite mitigation and the Conservation Commission asked us to look into that. What I handed out is above and beyond what we are doing onsite to mitigate the 1.75 acre dredge and fill. We submitted two applications one for a Special Exception to have a driveway crossing as well as a Variance because a portion of the building is in the wetlands. In meeting with DES and Conservation Commission they asked us to stay as far

away from Neil Brook. Your regulations call for a 25 foot undisturbed buffer to that wetland and a 40 foot buffer to the building. What we have done in maintained a 50 foot undisturbed buffer along the entire

wetlands and again that is above and beyond the mitigation. What that has done is pushed the building a little further into this wetland and what the Conservation Commission as well as DES has figured that this is a low quality wetland so it is worth filling this one to maintain a larger buffer. The beavers built a pretty good damn on Neil Brook five or six years ago and built a nice pond there. We are going through the planning process and they should have forwarded letters to you. At the Planning Board, there were a few minor comments. Dan Tatem from Stantec had comments regarding modifying these outlets slightly with a wing wall. They were very minor comments. We could minimize the wetland dredge and fill slightly more by being close to the buffer but again we are really responding to the wishes of the Conservation Commission.

R. Savoie: I take it your reference is to the letter from Stantec that said it would be better if you rotated the building counter clockwise to get it out of that buffer. However, you are going with what the Conservation Commission requested to keep it further away from the prime wetland.

T. Marcott: Yes, Dan wasn't really aware of the negotiation. We started this project with the Conservation Commission and DES and said does this make sense prior to moving to this stage of the project. Yes that is one of the reasons for my comments. Dan said one of the reasoning is how can this be minimized. They don't necessarily get involved in the whole project and see what else and see why we didn't want to rotate the building. We did move the building at the request of the Conservation Commission.

T. Murphy Roche:

The planning board sent their support with the exception that you shorten the culvert and extend the head wall with wing walls in order to reduce the impacts.

T. Marcott: Basically what we are doing is upgrading this culvert crossing. Right now there is a road that goes through there so in the final plan we minimize the wetland.

T. Murphy Roche: So that is what you intend on doing in the final plan?

T. Marcott: Yes we do

R Duhaime: I will give you comments from the site walk.

I agree with Tony about the wetlands they want to fill. We were there on a wet day and walked it when it was melting and there was very little run off in that area. It is definitely not a prime wetland. I don't think the overall effect to the wetlands will be hurt.

T Marcott: It was filled about 15 years ago when development was going on in this area under a separate owner and it was dredged out and you can tell it has been modified so many times and it is pretty low quality.

T. Murphy Roche: There is a phase one and two; will you do both buildings or one now and another later?

T. Marcott:

We will build phase one which is slightly under capacity. We will do all of the info structure, dredge and fill and work so that phase 2 is just a pad area. The history of this company is they started with a facility with 55,000 sq feet. Then they added 32,000 sq ft to that. They had another building that we started and was 90,000 sq ft and they added 35,000 sq ft to that. The history is when one phase is complete they start working on the other phase so on this project we

figured lets get all of the site work done, build the construction of phase two and build phase one. Then they will have all of the permits except for the building permit for phase two. If history follows then once phase one is complete, phase two will need to be built.

T. Murphy Roche: Will they close the two facilities?

T. Marcott: Currently one is for sale the smaller older facility but it really depends on if they can fill this facility and their newer facility. Their current capacity is about 220,000 sq ft. This is 340,000 sq ft and should take care of this. One of the business partners ships a lot of frozen seafood from over sea's and sells to Market Basket, Sam's Club so they have a lot of this and Phase one is for one of the partners. What they do is lease space to other companies such as Stony Field Yogurt. This phase one is really for one of the partners. Phase two they will see whether it makes sense. What they are doing is building a two-story office building so all of their operations will move to Hooksett and we were looking in Londonderry and other towns but this makes sense. For this project there are no really affected neighbors. The only abutter nearby spoke in favor of the project. This went through most of the process for a nine-lot subdivision and was conditionally approved but the planning board never signed it and that will be withdrawn by the owner and now will stay one lot. This is a much better use than a whole bunch of industrial area's that wouldn't technically fill the wetland areas but would be right up against them.

Open to abutters

Public

Closed

R Duhaime: As far as the comments from the planning board you are going to do the bio-retention?

T. Marcott: Yes, that is what we submitted and that is what we submitted to DES. The plant list is subject to suggestion because this is kind of a new type of area. We did considerable research with what UNH is using at their center as well as what is being used in other parts of the country. New Hampshire is trying to catch up to other people. We are open to any suggestions for bio-retention that is appropriate for New Hampshire. We are looking forward to the review by DES because this is what they are going to in the future or at lease one of the systems that in the next year that seems most appropriate.

T. Murphy Roche: You mentioned earlier that in this retention area that if the plants don't do what they are suppose to that they need to be replaced. Who maintains that?

T. Marcott: It is a maintenance plan. The owner maintains it as part of an inspection. It is part of the procedure. It could be tied to the DES permit or the town may require a maintenance plan for us to submit as an annual inspection. What happens is we design them for a certain storm and then

if we have weather like last May, who knows, we really never know what is going to come. If there is a spring and summer and it kills most of the plants then they will need to be replaced. It is a system that works by maintenance over time. It is like any system, if there is a lot of sediment anticipated or an icy winter we have to maintain the area like a catch basin. It is an ongoing maintenance program.

R. Savoie motioned to grant Special Exception from Article 18 Section E to build a 340,000 sq ft building and access way that impact approximately 1.8 acres of wetlands with the condition that the developer shorten the culvert and extend the headwall with wing walls in order to reduce the impacts per the planning board suggestion. Dick Johnston seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed motion carries

R. Savoie motioned to grant the Variance from Article 18 Section G.2 a&b to grant a variance for a 340,000 sq ft building that will impact the wetland and wetland setback and buffer. Seconded by R. Duhaime, all in favor, none opposed motion carries

NEW PUBLIC HEARING

MICHAEL & CHRISTINE HORNE

1 Monroe Drive Map 31 Lot 51

Variance from Article 5 Section E2 &E4 to add a 10X22 addition to the existing garage that will not meet the current side and rear setback requirements. The side having 14 feet where 15 is required and the rear having 20 feet where 25 is required.

M. Horne: I am here to get a variance to put a 10-foot addition on my garage with a room above it. I need a variance because based on the current zoning I am in the 15 foot side setback and the 25 foot rear lot setback. I talked to all of the abutters about it and they seemed in favor of it.

R. Savoie: The only house close to you is lot 52 correct?

M. Horne: Yes. The side that is close is the back lot.

T. Murphy Roche: How high is it going to be?

M. Horne: It is going to go a little bit above the house. The plan says height above grade is 21 feet.

R. Savoie: Are you going to tear down the old garage or are you just going to add onto it?

M. Horne: Yes, we will keep the frost wall and the slab and rebuild with 2X6 construction to code.

T. Murphy Roche: It looks like one of your neighbors did the same thing. How will the height impact your neighbors? But since none of them are here to object.

M. Horne: It is really the one behind

T. Murphy Roche: Is that lot 51?

M. Horne: Right and that is the corner in a cul-de-sac.

T. Murphy Roche: The house on lot 50 is on the market right?

M. Horne: No they took it off the market. Looking across at the height from their screen porch, that is where she would see some but right now it is wooded from there back.

C. Horne: I was concerned about the scale of this next to our house. The builder did a good job in addressing that issue. We didn't want it to look like a warehouse.

J. Levesque: The picture #5, is that the house that is lot 52?

M. Horne: Yes, I am looking from where the addition would be back to the house.

Open to abutters

Public

Closed

R. Savoie motion to grant the Variance from Article 5 Section E2 & E4 to add a 10X22 addition to the existing garage that will not meet the current side and rear setback requirements. The side having 14 feet where 15 is required and the rear having 20 feet where 25 is required.

R. Duhaime second. All in favor, none opposed motion carries.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF – March 13, 2007

J. Levesque motioned to approve the minutes Second by D. Johnston

All in favor, motion carries

ADJOURN motion by D. Johnston, R. Duhaime second all in favor

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Skorupski